DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 309 418 CS 211 912

AUTHOR Busterna, John C.; Hansen, Kathleen A.
TITLE Presidential Endorsement Patterns within Daily Newspaper Chains.
PUB DATE 10 Aug 89
NOTE 23p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication (72nd, Washington, DC, August 10-13, 1989).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Elections; Media Research; *Newspapers; *Political Influences; *Presidential Campaigns (United States)
IDENTIFIERS Editorial Policy; *Newspaper Chains; *Political Endorsements

ABSTRACT

Based on the premise that large newspaper chain ownership can threaten a diversity of ideas, a study investigated the extent to which individual newspapers' editorial autonomy may be damaged by chain ownership as reflected by presidential campaign endorsement patterns. Data for this study were compiled from "Editor & Publisher" magazine's 1976, 1980, and 1984 Quadrennial Presidential Poll. A total of 1,502 newspapers responded concerning presidential endorsements in all three years. Findings showed that: (1) chain ownership may play no role, or only a minor one, in affecting the content performances of daily newspapers; and (2) there is some evidence that chains may have an adverse impact on the economic performance of newspapers. (Two tables of data and 31 notes are included.) (MS)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
John C. Busterna
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)"

ED309418

# PRESIDENTIAL ENDORSEMENT PATTERNS WITHIN DAILY NEWSPAPER CHAINS

John C. Busterna and Kathleen A. Hansen
Associate Professors
University of Minnesota
School of Journalism and Mass Communication
111 Murphy Hall
206 Church Street S.E.
Minneapolis, MN 55455

Refereed paper accepted by the Mass Communication and Society Division for the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication conference, Washington, DC, August 10, 1989.

CS 211912

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

# PRESIDENTIAL ENDORSEMENT PATTERNS WITHIN DAILY NEWSPAPER CHAINS

The mass communication literature contains many studies involving the impact of newspaper chain ownership on both the "quality" and diversity of news and editorial content.[1] There has been substantial chain growth, particularly in large national chains, over the past two decades.[2] Large chain threats to diversity of ideas are of prime concern.

One of the most frequently-cited studies in this area related chain ownership to editorial autonomy [hereinafter referred to as Chain Newspaper Autonomy].[3] That study suggested that chain ownership causes member newspapers to make homogeneous presidential candidate endorsements within the chain. If we extend this measure of endorsement homogeneity to the coverage of news and opinion in general, this finding in Chain Newspaper Autonomy implied that chain ownership is associated with reduced diversity of editorial content.

This study will investigate the extent to which individual newspapers' editorial autonomy may be damaged by chain ownership as reflected by presidential campaign endorsement patterns. It updates the findings originally presented in Chain Newspaper Autonomy. However, it goes further by revising the method used in that previous study. These changes significantly alter the conclusions regarding the association of chain ownership and presidential endorsement patterns. The hypothesis of this study is that chain newspaper ownership is associated with greater presidential candidate endorsement homogeneity than would be

1

expected by random chance alone.

Effects of Newspaper Endorsements on Political Behavior

Chain newspaper presidential campaign endorsement patterns are important to the extent that newspaper endorsements affect political behavior. The literature on this subject can be divided into those studies which examine the effects of endorsements in non-presidential elections[4] and in presidential elections.[5] In both sets of studies, the results are mixed.

The preponderance of evidence suggests that in non-presidential elections, newspaper endorsements can, in certain circumstances and under limited conditions, affect the outcome of political contests. Mayoral elections, state and local legislative contests, trial court elections and other non-partisan contests were affected to some degree by newspaper endorsements. Those voters who identified themselves as "Independents," as last-minute deciders, or as marginally interested in the contests seemed to be the most affected by newspaper endorsements. However, each of the studies details the tenuous nature of the effects.

The effects of newspaper endorsements in presidential elections are more controversial. While the majority of studies do find some effect, the authors of most studies are careful to point out that effects vary from city to city, between types of voters and from election year to election year. Two studies do not find endorsement effects on presidential voting behavior (Counts, and Hurd and Singletary). Since a larger number of

studies do find that newspaper endorsements have some effect, and since later studies have improved upon and updated earlier efforts with similar results, it is reasonable to assume that endorsements can, under certain circumstances, affect political behavior. With that assumption, it is then important to determine whether chain ownership of newspapers affects editorial autonomy in endorsement decisions.

## Chain Editorial Policies

Bagdikian reported that in the early 1980's 20 corporations controlled over half of daily newspaper circulation.[6] By 1986, that number had been reduced to 15.[7] This concentration of ownership puts into the hands of these 15 companies the potential for affecting the knowledge and opinions the public comes to possess on many national and international matters. In this context, the role that concentrated ownership plays in determining the editorial policy of the individual newspapers owned by these companies becomes important.

The direct means of determining the nature of corporate headquarters interference with the editorial decisions of individual newspapers is to ask the chain newspaper owners themselves. This method yields many testimonials by chain owners that editorial policies are set at their individual newspapers.[8]

Not only might one suspect that these are self-serving comments that may not accurately describe the true level of editorial autonomy within chains, but there is some independent evidence that suggests this is the case. Bagdikian presents some anecdotes that belie autonomy in some chains.[9] In Chain

Newspaper Autonomy, the authors conclude that "clearly these data run counter to the insistence of chain spokesmen that their endorsement policies are independent from chain direction."[10]

This calls for some indirect method to independently measure the influence of chain headquarters on local presidential endorsement decisions. Beyond Chain Newspaper Autonomy, apparently no research has been devoted to this specific question. Indeed, many studies have made comparisons between chain and non-chain newspapers on such criteria as the quantity of space devoted to various types of editorials or the average number of letters to the editor. However, only one other study deals with the issue of whether newspapers within chains are forced to collude on various editorial positions. Wagenberg and Soderlund found no appearance of editorial collusion among four newspapers selected from a Canadian chain.[11]

Other studies examine newspaper endorsement decision-making, without reference to ownership variables. Ragland[12] found that among New Mexico daily newspapers that endorsed a mayoral candidate since 1981, 50% of the time the publisher made the ultimate decision as to who, if anyone, would be endorsed. The publisher and editor jointly made the decision 29% of the time, an editorial board decided 14% of the time, and 7% said the editor alone decided. Clarke and Evans[13] found that 1978 congressional contest endorsement decisions were usually made by editorial page editors without the participation of the political reporters covering the campaigns. A minority of political reporters (40%) participated in endorsement discussions. The

more "industrious" political reporters were more likely to have access to the editorial page staff.

In Chain Newspaper Autonomy, a more ambitious indirect method of measuring chain headquarters interference in local editorial decisions was employed. That study performed a secondary analysis of data collected by Editor & Publisher magazine in its Quadrennial Presidential Poll for the years 1960-1972.[14] The E&P poll asks all daily newspapers whether they are endorsing a particular presidential candidate, are declining to endorse anyone, or are yet undecided (the poll results are published shortly before each election).

Chain Newspaper Autonomy defined a chain as three or more dailies in different cities under common ownership. Chains with 85% or more of its newspapers endorsing the same presidential candidate were defined as homogeneous. The unit of analysis was individual chains that were not weighted by circulation size. The proportion of homogeneous chains was 80% in 1960, 64% in 1964, 76% in 1968 and 91% in 1972. Without conducting any statistical tests on these data, the authors concluded that these percentages were high enough to indicate that individual chain newspapers did not have endorsement autonomy.

## Method

Data for this study were compiled from Editor & Publisher magazine's 1976, 1980 and 1984 Quadrennial Presidential Poll.[15] Data for the 1988 presidential election were not comparable to previous polls, because the magazine staff used an earlier cutoff date for newspaper responses.[16] As a result most newspapers

reported that they hadn't yet endorsed a candidate. In the 1984 poll, 450 newspapers reported they had endorsed a candidate while only 246 did so in 1988. The comparability problem was further compounded when the magazine staff tried to make up for this shortfall by telephoning selected large newspapers for their decisions.[17] Therefore, 1988 data are not included in this analysis.

A list of responding newspapers and their endorsements was compiled from each of the three poll articles. Circulation size and ownership information for each newspaper listed was obtained from the appropriate Editor & Publisher International Yearbook. This study uses the standard industry and scholarly definition of newspaper chain--two or more dailies in different cities under common ownership. This results in a 60% increase in the number of chains than would have been included under the non-standard definition used in Chain Newspaper Autonomy. This makes the results here comparable to the existing research literature on chain ownership.

Another alteration was made in the definition of homogeneity. In Chain Newspaper Autonomy, the homogeneity threshold was 85%. Here, all the newspapers in a chain must endorse the same candidate for the chain to be considered homogeneous. The concept of endorsement autonomy means that individual newspapers within a chain have the ability to endorse any candidate. Thus, if even one newspaper endorses a different candidate than the others within the chain, the chain allows endorsement autonomy and is not homogeneous.

Another change involves how the data were analyzed. Chain Newspaper Autonomy used individual chains as the unit of analysis and did not weight by circulation size. This assumes that all chains have the same potential impact on political behavior. However, a chain that controls 6 million circulation should have considerably more potential impact on political opinions and behavior than a chain of 10,000. This study weights each chain by its circulation.

In order to test the hypothesis, it is necessary to compare the actual level of endorsement homogeneity within chains with some standard. This standard is the level of homogeneity found in randomly-created chains consisting of newspapers grouped without regard to their ownership. By constructing several such random groupings, the mean and standard deviation of the homogeneity level can be computed. With this information, it is possible to infer whether the actual level of homogeneity within chains is significantly greater than the results obtained by random chance.

The list of all responding newspapers, regardless of ownership type, was entered into a computer database for each of the three election years. Each election year had a unique number of responding 2-paper, 3-paper, 4-paper, etc., chains. A random-number generator selected newspapers into these predetermined groupings for each year. This process was repeated 30 times. The mean and standard deviation from these 30 runs were compared to the actual level of within-chain homogeneity using a one-tailed t-test. The one-tailed test is theoretically appropriate since we have no reason to expect that the homogeneity of

endorsements within actual chains would be purposefully lower than random chance.

## Results

In 1976, 37.4% of all daily newspapers, representing 55.2% of total daily circulation, responded to the E&P survey. In 1980, 60.2% of dailies with 60.5% of total circulation responded. For the 1984 E&P poll, 39.1% of dailies responded with 56.7% of total circulation.

Table 1 reports on the endorsement patterns of all daily newspapers in the E&P surveys that endorsed either the Republican or Democrat candidate. These data show that chains were not more likely than non-chains to endorse the GOP candidate. Further, chain newspapers were not more likely than non-chains to endorse the overall press-favored candidate. This last finding runs contrary to the earlier data analyzed in Chain Newspaper Autonomy.[18]

In addition, the data in Table 1 also show that endorsements skewed heavily in favor of the Republican candidate each election regardless of the type of newspaper ownership. Thus, we would expect a large degree of apparent homogeneity within chains to be caused merely by the high propensity of each newspaper to endorse the GOP candidate. This is further evidence of the need to compare the actual homogeneity of endorsements within chains to the high level we would expect to find due to random chance alone. This comparison is found in Table 2.

TABLE 1
PERCENT OF CHAIN AND NON-CHAIN NEWSPAPERS ENDORSEMENTS BY YEAR

| | Republican | Democrat | Number of Newspapers |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1976: | | | |
| Chain | 83% | 17% | 264 |
| Non-Chain | 86 | 14 | 229 |
| Total | 84 | 16 | 493 |
| 1980: | | | |
| Chain | 79 | 21 | 353 |
| Non-Chain | 77 | 23 | 206 |
| Total | 78 | 22 | 559 |
| 1984: | | | |
| Chain | 86 | 14 | 299 |
| Non-Chain | 86 | 14 | 151 |
| Total | 86 | 14 | 450 |

Note: The numbers of newspapers in this table and in the subsequent analysis are taken from the individual listings in the E&P articles, not from their summary tables. These figures vary slightly. Newspapers that were "undecided," "uncommitted," or endorsed another candidate are excluded from these figures.

The results in Table 2 are mixed for the three presidential election years. The critical value at the .05 level for the one-tailed t-test employed in Table 2 is 1.70. Thus, the actual level of homogeneous endorsements within chains in 1976 falls just short of being statistically greater than the level found by random chance. For 1980, we can be fairly confident that the actual level of homogeneity is significantly greater than the random results. However, in 1984, the levels of actual and random homogeneity are not close to being statistically different. Therefore, we are unable to reject the null hypothesis that there is no greater presidential endorsement homogeneity within chains than that expected by random chance.

TABLE 2
HOMOGENEITY OF PRESIDENTIAL ENDORSEMENT PATTERNS:
100% HOMOGENEITY IN CIRCULATION-WEIGHTED CHAINS

| Year | Actual Chains | Randomly-Created Chain Sets (n = 30) | t Value |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1976 | 51.8% | 38.3% (s.d.=8.04) | 1.68 |
| 1980 | 53.3 | 28.1 (s.d.=5.39) | 4.68*** |
| 1984 | 42.4 | 37.2 (s.d.=7.68) | 0.68 |

***p<.001 for a one-tailed t-test

Note: Percentages represent circulation in homogeneous chains as a proportion of total chain circulation. Newspapers from 54 chains responded to the survey in 1976, 71 in 1980, and 56 in 1984. The 40 dailies that endorsed Anderson in 1980 are excluded from this analysis.

In addition, these results appear to be greatly affected by the endorsement status of the Tribune Company chain. The Tribune Company is among the top five national chains when ranked by circulation. In 1984, the six Tribune Company newspapers responding to the E&P survey were heterogeneous in their endorsements. In 1976 and 1980, only four and three Tribune Company papers, respectively, responded and they all endorsed the Republican candidate. We know that with the heterogeneous endorsements in 1984, Tribune Company newspapers probably had the ability to be heterogeneous in 1976 and 1980. Had they been, the actual level of homogeneity in Table 2 would have been reduced to

35.4% in 1976 and 38.4% in 1980 due to the large circulation represented by the responding Tribune newspapers. This level of homogeneity for 1976 is below the figure obtained by random chance. For 1980, the t-value would have been reduced to 1.92 which is statistically significant at only the .05 level. This lends further support to the conclusion that we cannot reject the null hypothesis of this study.

## Discussion

The earlier study of presidential endorsement patterns within chains concluded:

> ...these data would appear to contradict clearly the proposition advanced by spokesmen for chain ownership, and the hypothesis of this study, that members of chains are quite independent in their political endorsement editorial policies.[19]

This study presented here was unable to draw the same conclusion for three more recent presidential elections. One important basis for the different conclusions must surely be the very different methods used to address the issue of endorsement homogeneity within chains.

There may also be important real changes over the two time periods studied. Chain Newspaper Autonomy found the average proportion of homogeneous chains to be 78% for the election years 1960-1972. Using the method of that study for the 1976-1984 election years analyzed here, the proportion of homogeneous chains drops to 65%. This large drop in homogeneity may appear paradoxical given the fears engendered by the large increase in the size of newspaper chains since the first study. Nixon reported the average chain size to be 5.2 dailies in 1968, a

figure that had declined somewhat from its peak of 5.6 in 1930.[20] By 1986, this number had jumped to 9.1.[21]

This seeming paradox has occurred because the large national chains that dominate the newspaper industry in recent years have a more heterogeneous endorsement pattern than the smaller regional chains that typified the industry 25 years ago. For instance, in 1980 some of the largest chains such as Gannett, Thomson, Donrey, Park, Lee, Media General, Knight-Ridder, Cox and Harte-Hanks all were heterogeneous in their endorsement patterns.[22]

The largest chains now own a wide variety of types of newspapers--metro and rural papers, large and small circulation papers, papers in different regions of the country. It may be that region of the country, circulation size, metro vs. rural, or some other local characteristics have more influence on endorsement decision patterns than chain ownership per se.[23] In the future, as individual chains grow in size, endorsement homogeneity may continue to decline. Furthermore, large national chains are thought to be more concerned about maximizing profits than small regional chains. If this is true, local newspaper managers within the large chains may have more editorial autonomy as long as they meet their profit goals.

Chains exhibited greater homogeneity in the three presidential elections studied here, even though the differences were not significant in two of the three cases. This non-significant tendency toward greater homogeneity within chains is sometimes caused by overt policies by chain management. Scripps-

Howard, one of the larger national chains, has such a policy. In 1980, Scripps-Howard required all their newspaper editors to meet with chain editorial management executives to vote on who the group would endorse. One editorial was prepared to run in all Scripps-Howard newspapers.[24]

However, in most cases greater homogeneity may be the result of other, more subtle, forces. The socialization of newsworkers and newspaper executives, the pressure to conform to professional and industry norms, the need to meet superiors' expectations within the organization, and the desire to please powerful sources outside the organization are recognized as forces that may affect media content.[25] By extension, some of this research literature suggests that chain newspaper management need not explicitly state endorsement policy to enforce homogeneity. A climate may be created within which chain managers' wishes regarding endorsements are implicitly understood by editors and publishers at each newspaper.

Newspaper presidential endorsements continue to heavily favor the Republican candidate in each election. Since E&P magazine began its quadrennial poll in 1932, the Republican candidate has received more endorsements than the Democrat candidate every year except in 1964.[26] This reflects the essentially conservative tendencies of the powerful elite in general, including newspaper publishers. According to Donohew, newspaper publishers tend to identify most closely with members of the business community, lawyers, bankers, and public officials.[27] Peterson et al. found that newspaper business editors had statistically significantly more favorable attitudes

toward capitalism and toward business in general than the general public.[28] Aside from publishers in some Northeastern seaboard newspapers,[29] news executives' reference groups tend to be among the more Republican elements of society, and their newspaper endorsements reflect this.

Thus, chain ownership may play no role, or only a minor one, in affecting the content performance of daily newspapers as most of the studies cited in footnote one indicate. The findings reported here are consistent with this literature. Chains exhibited statistically greater homogeneity in one of the three years studied, but not in the other two. Further, attributing homogeneity to the Tribune Company chain in two of the three years, when we know they allow heterogeneity, significantly overstates the level of homogeneity in the national samples. Therefore, this study further substantiates the idea that, on balance, chain ownership does not have much to do with content performance.

However, there is some evidence that chains may have an adverse impact on the economic performance of newspapers. Some studies associate chain ownership with higher advertising prices,[30] or other economic harms.[31] Future research should place a greater emphasis on studying the economic performance of chain versus non-chain newspapers. For now, we lack adequate evidence that chain ownership is associated with greater presidential endorsement homogeneity.

ENDNOTES

[1]See footnotes 1 and 2 in John C. Busterna, "Competitive Effects of Newspaper Chain 'Deep Pockets'," Newspaper Research Journal, 10:61-72, (Fall 1988), pp. 68-70. Footnote 1 summarizes 20 studies which show positive, neutral, or mixed content effects from chain ownership. Footnote 2 summarizes eight studies which show negative content effects from chain ownership.

[2]John C. Busterna, "Trends in Daily Newspaper Ownership," Journalism Quarterly, 65:831-8 (Winter 1988), p. 835.

[3]Daniel B. Wackman, Donald M. Gillmor, Cecelie Gaziano and Everette E. Dennis, "Chain Newspaper Autonomy as Reflected in Presidential Campaign Endorsements," Journalism Quarterly, (Autumn 1975), 52:411-20.

[4]Those studies that find newspaper endorsement effects in non-presidential contests include: Norman Blume and Schley Lyons, "The Monopoly Newspaper in a Local Election: The Toledo Blade," Journalism Quarterly, (Summer 1968), 45:286-92; Philip L. DuBois, "Voting Cues in Nonpartisan Trial Court Elections: A Multivariate Assessment," Law and Society Review, (1984), 18:395-436; Paul L. Hain, "How an Endorsement Affected a Non-Partisan Mayoral Vote," Journalism Quarterly, (Summer 1975), 52:337-40; Michael Hooper, "Party and Newspaper Endorsements as Predictors of Voter Choice," Journalism Quarterly, (Summer 1969), 46:302-05; William M. Mason, "The Impact of Endorsements on Voting," Sociological Methods and Research, (May 1973), 1:463-95; Jack Sean McClenghan, "Effect of Endorsements in Texas Local Elections," Journalism Quarterly, (Summer 1973), 50:363-66; Maxwell McCombs, "Editorial Endorsements: A Study of Influence," Journalism Quarterly,

(Autumn 1967), 44:545-48; James L. McDowell, "The Role of Newspapers in Illinois' At-Large Election," Journalism Quarterly, (Spring 1965), 42:281-84; John E. Mueller, "Choosing Among 133 Candidates," Public Opinion Quarterly, (Fall 1970), 34:395-402; Byron St. Dizier, "The Effect of Newspaper Endorsements and Party Identification on Voting Choice," Journalism Quarterly, (Autumn 1985), 62:589-94; Howard A. Scarrow with Steve Borman, "The Effects of Newspaper Endorsements on Election Outcomes: A Case Study," Public Opinion Quarterly, (Fall 1979), 43:388-93. A study that finds no effects of newspaper endorsements on proposition voting is John E. Mueller, "Voting on the Propositions: Ballot Patterns and Historical Trends in California," The American Political Science Review, (December 1969), 63:1197-1212.

[5]Those studies that find newspaper endorsements effects in presidential contests include: Robert S. Erikson, "The Influence of Newspaper Endorsements in Presidential Elections: The Case of 1964," American Journal of Political Science, (May 1976), 20:207-33; Fred Fedler, Tim Counts and Lowndes F. Stephens, "Newspaper Endorsements and Voter Behavior in the 1980 Presidential Election," Newspaper Research Journal, (Fall 1982), 4:3-11; James E. Gregg, "Newspaper Editorial Endorsements and California Elections, 1948-62," Journalism Quarterly, (Autumn 1965), 42:532-38; John P. Robinson, "Perceived Media Bias and the 1968 Vote: Can the Media Affect Behavior After All?," Journalism Quarterly, (Summer 1972), 49:239-46; John P. Robinson, "The Press and the Voter," Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social

Science, (September 1976), 427:95-103; John P. Robinson, "The Press as King-Maker: What Surveys From Last Five Campaigns Show," Journalism Quarterly, (Winter 1974), 51:587-94, 606; Dale Vinyard and Roberta S. Sigel, "Newspapers and Urban Voters," Journalism Quarterly, (Autumn 1971), 48:486-93. Two studies that do not find newspaper endorsement effects in presidential elections are: Tim Counts, "Effect of Endorsements on Presidential Vote," Journalism Quarterly, (Autumn 1985), 62:644-647; and Robert E. Hurd and Michael W. Singletary, "Newspaper Endorsement Influence on the 1980 Presidential Election Vote," Journalism Quarterly, (Summer 1984), 61:332-38.

[6]Ben H. Bagdikian, The Media Monopoly, (Boston: Beacon Press, 1983), p. 4.

[7]Ben H. Bagdikian, The Media Monopoly, 2d ed., (Boston: Beacon Press, 1987), p. 22.

[8]Wackman, et al., op. cit., p. 413; Bagdikian (1987), op. cit., pp. 75-89.

[9]Bagdikian (1987), op. cit.

[10]Wackman, et al., op. cit., p. 419.

[11]Ronald H. Wagenberg and Walter C. Soderlund, "The Influence of Chain-Ownership on Editorial Comment in Canada," Journalism Quarterly, (Spring 1975), 52:93-8.

[12]Ruth Ann Ragland, "How Mayor Candidates Seek Endorsements in New Mexico," Journalism Quarterly, (Spring 1987), 64:199-202.

[13]Peter Clarke and Susan H. Evans, "'All in a Day's Work': Reporters Covering Congressional Campaigns," Journal of Communication, (Autumn 1980), 30:112-121.

[14]Robert U. Brown, "57% of U.S. Dailies Back Nixon; 16% for

Kennedy," Editor & Publisher, November 5, 1960, pp. 9-13; "440 for LBJ--359 for Barry," Editor & Publisher, October 31, 1964, pp. 9-13; "634 for Nixon--146 for Humphrey," Editor & Publisher, November 2, 1968, pp. 9-12; "753 Dailies for Nixon; 56 Support McGovern," Editor & Publisher, November 4, 1972, pp. 9-14.

[15]George Wilt, "411 Dailies Support Ford; 80 for Carter; 168 Newspapers are Uncommitted," Editor & Publisher, October 30, 1976, pp. 5, 12-13, 40-41; John Consoli, "E&P Poll: Reagan Backed by 443 Dailies; Carter Trails with 126; Anderson with 40 and 439 Undecided," Editor & Publisher, November 1, 1980, pp. 9-13; Andrew Radolf, "A Newspaper Majority for Reagan: E&P's Quadrennial Presidential Poll Shows that 381 Dailies Support Reagan; 62 Support Mondale; and 216 are Uncommitted," Editor & Publisher, November 3, 1984, pp. 9-12.

[16]Andrew Radolf, "Majority of Newspapers Don't Endorse," Editor & Publisher, October 29, 1988, pp. 9-11.

[17]Andrew Radolf, "Dukakis Closes the Editorial Gap," Editor & Publisher, November 5, 1988, pp. 9-10.

[18]Wackman, et al., op. cit., p. 417.

[19]Id., p. 419.

[20]Raymond B. Nixon, "Trends in U.S. Newspaper Ownership: Concentration with Competition," Gazette, 14:181-93 (#3, 1968), p. 184.

[21]Busterna, Journalism Quarterly, 1988, op. cit., p. 833.

[22]Consoli, op. cit., p. 10.

[23]Wackman, et al., op. cit., p. 419, states that single-region chains were more homogeneous than multiple-region chains.

[24]Consoli, op. cit., p. 10.

[25]See, for example, David R. Bowers, "A Report on Activity by Publishers in Directing Newsroom Decisions," Journalism Quarterly, (Spring 1967), 44:43-52; Warren Breed, "Social Control in the Newsroom: A Functional Analysis," Social Forces, (May 1955), 33:326-35; John Dimmick and Philip Coit, "Levels of Analysis in Mass Media Decision Making: A Taxonomy, Research Strategy, and Illustrative Data Analysis," Communication Research, (January 1982), 9:3-32; Lewis Donohew, "Publishers and Their 'Influence' Groups," Journalism Quarterly, (Winter 1965), 42:112-13; Mark Fishman, Manufacturing the News, (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1980); Herbert J. Gans, Deciding What's News, (New York: Random House 1979); John W. C. Johnstone, Edward J. Slawski and William W. Bowman, The News People, (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1976); John W. C. Johnstone, "Organizational Constraints on Newswork," Journalism Quarterly, (Spring 1976), 53:5-13; Robert Karl Manoff and Michael Schudson, eds., Reading the News, (New York: Pantheon, 1986); Harvey Molotch and Marilyn Lester, "News as Purposive Behavior: On the Strategic Use of Routine Events, Accidents, and Scandals," American Sociological Review, (1974), 39:101-12; Barbara E. Phillips, "Approaches to Objectivity: Journalistic Versus Social Science Perspectives," Chapter 3 in Paul M. Hirsch, Peter V. Miller and F. Gerald Kline, eds., Strategies for Communication Research, Vol. 6, Sage Annual Reviews of Communication Research, (Beverly Hills, CA: Sage, 1977), pp. 63-77; Bernard Roshco, Newsmaking, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975); Pamela J. Shoemaker, "Building a Theory of News Content: A Synthesis of

Current Approaches," Journalism Monographs, Number 103, (June 1987), pp. 8-19; Leon V. Sigal, Reporters and Officials: The Organization and Politics of Newsmaking, (Lexington, MA: D. C. Heath, 1973); Lee Sigelman, "Reporting the News: An Organizational Analysis," American Journal of Sociology, (1973), 79:132-51; Gaye Tuchman, Making News: A Study in the Construction of Reality, (New York: Free Press, 1978); Gaye Tuchman, "Objectivity as Strategic Ritual: An Examination of Newsmen's Notions of Objectivity," American Journal of Sociology, (1972), 77:660-79; David H. Weaver and G. Cleveland Wilhoit, The American Journalist, (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1986).

[26]Radolf, (October 29, 1988), op. cit., p. 10. See also Byron St. Dizier, "Republican Endorsements, Democratic Positions: An Editorial Page Contradiction," Journalism Quarterly, 63(3):581-586, (Autumn 1986).

[27]Donohew, op. cit.

[28]Robert A. Peterson, Gerald Albaum, George Kozmetsky and Isabella C. M. Cunningham, "Attitudes of Newspaper Business Editors and General Public Toward Capitalism," Journalism Quarterly, 61(1):56-65, (Spring 1984).

[29]Weaver and Wilhoit, op. cit, pp. 25-32.

[30]William B. Blankenburg, "A Newspaper Chain's Pricing Behavior," Journalism Quarterly, 60:275-80, (Summer 1983); John C. Busterna, "National Advertising Pricing Conduct: Chain Versus Independent Newspapers," Journalism Quarterly, 65:305-10+, (Summer 1988); James M. Ferguson, "Daily Newspaper Advertising Rates, Local Media Cross-Ownership, Newspaper Chains, and Media

Competition," Journal of Law and Economics, 26:635-54, (October 1983).

[31]John C. Busterna, "Daily Newspaper Chains and the Antitrust Laws," Journalism Monographs, Number 110, (March 1989).